PP4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,063	04/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010005US1	8503

7590 06/06/2003

Marilyn Smith Dawkins
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
Internal Zip 4054, 11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
CHEN, CHONGSHAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	3

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/843,063	Applicant(s) DUTTA ET AL.	
	Examiner Chongshan Chen	Art Unit 2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are pending in this Office Action.

Drawings

2. This application, filed under former 37 CFR 1.60, lacks formal drawings. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings. In unusual circumstances, the formal drawings from the abandoned parent application may be transferred by the grant of a petition under 37 CFR 1.182.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The reference cited in the IDS, PTO-1449, Paper No. 2, has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 11-18, 25-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et al. ["Moore", Pub. No.: US 2001/0039546 A1].

As per claim 1, Moore discloses a method for displaying, at a client, transient messages received over a network, the method comprising:

capturing, independently of a user action, at different times, at least two screen images having at least one multimedia object containing at least one transient message rendered on a display at the client; storing each captured screen image; and enabling a subsequent rendering of at least one of the stored screen captured images in response to a user selection (Moore, page 1, [0011], "enables a user to easily capture and manage useful information (such as web links, advertisements, or points of interest while traveling) for later review without interruption of the current activity (such as browsing web pages, using a web search engine, viewing a media stream, or operating a mobile computing device while traveling). This "transparency" of operation is supported through use of a variety of modes for manual or automatic capturing of information optimized for use with these different types of activities.").

As per claim 2, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses the user selection is a selection of an identification of a stored captured screen image from a displayed list of identifications of stored captured screen images (Moore, page 2, [0021] – [0022]).

As per claim 3, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses displaying a plurality of the captured screen images in succession in response to a user selection of a control button (Moore, page 2, [0021] – [0022]).

As per claim 11, Moore discloses a method for displaying, at a client, transient messages received over a network, the method comprising:

saving data, independently of a user action, associated with a screen image of each dynamically displayed transitory message; redisplaying the screen image of at least one previously displayed transitory message upon request by a user (Moore, page 1, [0011]).

As per claim 12, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 11, and further discloses saving a screen image of each message and at least one hyperlink associated with the message (Moore, page 2, [0021] – [0022]).

As per claim 13, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 12, and further discloses saving a screen image of each message and at least one hyperlink in accordance with a time value representative of a time in which a given message was originally displayed (Moore, page 2, [0021] – [0022]).

As per claim 14, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 11, and further discloses redisplaying a sequence of each saved image at a rate predetermined by the user (Moore, page 1, [0011]).

As per claim 15, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 11, and further discloses redisplaying a scrollable page having a plurality of the saved images (Moore, page 5, [0053] – [0056]).

As per claim 16, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 11, and further discloses redisplaying the at least one previously displayed transitory message in at least one of image format and heading format (Moore, page 2, [0021] – [0022]).

As per claim 17, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 16, and further discloses retrieving content associated with a link associated with a redisplayed message resulting from a selection by a user of at least one of selecting from a title list and selecting a redisplayed image of the message (Moore, page 2, [0021] – [0022]).

As per claim 18, Moore discloses a computer system having a display for displaying transient messages received over a network, the computer system comprising:

means for capturing, independently of a user action, at different times, at least two screen images having at least one multimedia object containing at least one transient message rendered on the display; a storage area having each captured screen image; and means for enabling a subsequent rendering of at least one of the stored screen captured images in response to a user selection (Moore, page 1, [0011]).

Claim 25 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 11.

Claim 26 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 13.

Claim 27 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 14.

Claim 28 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim 29 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 9.

Claim 31 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 11.

Claim 32 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 13.

Claim 33 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim 34 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. ["Moore", Pub. No.: US 2001/0039546 A1] in view of Parthasarathy et al. ["Parthasarathy", 6,412,013].

As per claim 4, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, except for explicitly disclosing a rate in which the succession of captured screen images are displayed is a user configurable rate. Parthasarathy discloses a rate in which the succession of captured screen images are displayed is a user configurable rate (Parthasarathy, col. 4, lines 10-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Parthasarathy with Moore in order to display screen at a predetermined rate.

8. Claims 5-6 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. ["Moore", Pub. No.: US 2001/0039546 A1] in view of Yano et al. ["Yano", Pub. No.: US 2003/0037158 A1].

As per claim 5, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the different times are determined by a configurable periodic interval. Yano discloses the different times are determined by a configurable periodic interval (Yano, page 3, [0060]).

As per claim 6, Moore and Yano teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, and further discloses the configurable periodic interval occurs for a configurable duration of time (Yano, page 3, [0060]).

Claims 19-20 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 5-6.

9. Claims 7, 9, 21, 23 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. ["Moore", Pub. No.: US 2001/0039546 A1].

As per claim 7, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the different times are determined by a change in content. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the different times by the change in content of the screen image so that the system will not capture same screen image and store duplicated copies of screen image in the database and waste storage space. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to capture screen image when a change in content occurs in order to avoid duplicated copies of screen image in the database.

As per claim 9, Moore discloses a method for displaying, at a client, at least one transient message received over a network, the method comprising:

capturing, independently of a user action, a screen image; storing each captured screen image; and enabling a subsequent rendering of at least one of the stored screen capture images in response to a user selection (Moore, page 1, [0011], "enables a user to easily capture and manage useful information (such as web links, advertisements, or points of interest while traveling) for later review without interruption of the current activity (such as browsing web pages, using a web search engine, viewing a media stream, or operating a mobile computing device while traveling). This "transparency" of operation is supported through use of a variety of modes for manual or automatic capturing of information optimized for use with these different types of activities.").

Moore does not explicitly disclose determining a change in content of at least one displayed page received over a network wherein at least one of the at least one displayed pages contains at least one transient message.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a change in content of at least one displayed page received over a network wherein at least one of the at least one displayed pages contains at least one transient message so that the system will not capture same screen image multiple times and store duplicated copies of screen image in the database and waste storage space. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to capture screen image when a change in content occurs in order to avoid duplicated copies of screen image in the database.

Claim 21 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 7.

Claim 23 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 9.

Claim 35 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 9.

10. Claims 8, 10, 22, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ["Moore", Pub. No.: US 2001/0039546 A1] in view of Lynch et al. ["Lynch", Pub. No.: US 2002/0111972 A1].

As per claim 8, Moore teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, except for explicitly disclosing the change in content is determined by utilizing a DOM model of the displayed page to determine the change of content as a triggering event to capture the screen image. Lynch discloses the change in content is determined by utilizing a DOM model of the displayed page to determine the change of content as a triggering event to capture the screen

image (Lynch, page 4, [0063]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lynch with Moore in order to use DOM to determine the change in content.

Claims 10, 22, 24 and 30 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703)305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

CC
June 2, 2003

SHAHID AL ALAM
PATENT EXAMINER